

be the open sesame to a job with income sufficient to repay indebtedness. Rather, it may be a millstone around the neck of the graduate.

So the opportunity to earn is a vast encouragement to a group of potential contributors to society, young men and women with ample abilities but subject to possible construction of them unless they receive practical encouragement, a group who collectively earned \$95 million last year. For the 56,000 students in cooperative education programs at 112 institutions in 1966-67, this meant an average self-help of about \$1,900. To a great many, this makes the difference between continuing their education and foregoing it for economic reasons.

Many institutions have expressed a desire to join in this type of education. Even without the assistance proposed in this amendment, the list of those with such programs has risen in 1968 to 119 at present while the enrollment has reached a total of 61,000. Collectively these students are earning \$104 million in their full-time jobs during the work periods away from the campus and the classroom.

Now, it is a significant fact that these students are paying at least 10 percent of their total earnings in taxes to the Federal and State Governments. That comes to more than \$10 million—more than the \$8 million the amendment asks for the first year's program. The remaining \$94 million pays for all, or nearly all, of the cost of these students' education.

That is the existing situation. From the cost standpoint, the results are even more remarkable, although as I have said it is best to keep the educational values as our primary focus. The assistance offered here for cooperative education would enable more than 400 additional institutions of higher learning to move vigorously to expand this method, with the grants of up to \$75,000 per year allowing employment of professionally qualified staffs to supervise and coordinate the programs. As a result, with opportunity created in the next few years for an additional 250,000 students to join those now in these programs, I anticipate earnings among them to expand to more than \$500 million per year. In addition to the tax results to the Federal Government through income tax receipts well in excess of the program's costs, there is the permanent and far greater additional Federal income throughout the lifetime of all those whose skills have upgraded their income and thereby added to income tax payments.

Many of the institutions which would be affected are smaller schools, although large universities are also already involved. For such a school as the Indiana Institute of Technology, located in Fort Wayne, the institution itself will be greatly strengthened by this assistance. Indiana Tech has had a small co-op program for the past 5 years, with about 100 students currently involved out of a 1,200-member student body. They are eager to expand this program, and have sought funds from the Office of Education to do so—funds which unfortunately were not available to them for

the next academic year. But President Edward Dugan has informed me, and this is a clue to the situation throughout the country, that they now have about 100 firms on their waiting list, ready to cooperate with an expanded program, and that of the anticipated freshman class of about 300 for next fall some 60 percent have indicated they would like to be in a cooperative education program.

For such schools as these, the opportunity to secure "seed money" for developing this service is very greatly needed. It is no less needed in many larger and stronger institutions, where the pressures for funds make innovations of this kind take a back seat to current traditional programs. The incentives which the proposed Federal grants will supply are sufficient, even with a \$75,000 limit per institution, to stimulate a rapid increase in this highly practical form of education.

I sincerely hope that when the Higher Education Act amendments are presented to the Senate by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, it will include the opportunity to include action on this most significant means of assistance to higher education.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Record a summary of the proposed amendments, together with a current list of the 119 institutions now offering cooperative education programs, as prepared by the National Commission for Cooperative Education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the summary and list will be printed in the Record.

The amendment (No. 705) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The summary and list, presented by Mr. HARTKE, are as follows:

SUMMARY OF HARTKE-KUCHEL AMENDMENTS TO S. 3098

The proposed amendments to S. 3098, the Higher Education Amendments bill of 1968, would add a new part D to title IV (Student Assistance) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize the Commissioner of Education to make (1) grants to institutions of higher education (not in excess of \$75,000 to any one institution for any fiscal year) to plan, establish, expand, or carry out programs of "cooperative education" under which students would alternate periods of full-time academic study with periods of full-time public or private employment, and (2) grants to, or contracts with, such institutions, or (as variously provided) other public or private organizations, for the training of persons in the planning and operation of cooperative education programs, or for research into methods of improving, developing, or promoting the use of such programs in institutions of higher education.

Employment under these programs would be designed to provide students not only with financial assistance for continuing their education but also with work experience related to their courses of study. However, grants would not be available for compensation of students for their employment by employers participating in the programs.

In developing criteria for approval of cooperative education grants, the Commissioner would be required to consult with the Ad-

visory Council on Financial Aid to Students to be established by title IV of S. 3098.

There would be authorized to be appropriated \$8 million for fiscal 1969, \$10 million for fiscal 1970, \$12 million for fiscal 1971, and \$15 million for each of the fiscal years 1972 and 1973, for cooperative education grants, and \$750,000 per fiscal year, 1969 through 1973, for training and research grants and contracts.

These amendments would supersede § 409 (b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as proposed to be added by S. 3098, which would have authorized institutions of higher education to use a portion of their work-study allocation to pay administrative costs of developing or carrying out programs of cooperative education. The present proposal, like the one to be superseded, includes accredited proprietary institutions within the definition of "institution of higher education."

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OFFERING COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

At many of these 119 institutions, only some of the students are on the cooperative plan: It may be an optional plan, it may be offered in only some academic majors, it may be an honors plan. The interested student should write to the Admissions Office of the college or university of his choice requesting information about their program, and to secure specific information about the requirements for admission, scholarships, and possible financial assistance.

Alabama: Alabama Agricultural & Mechanical College, Normal; Auburn University, Auburn; Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee Institute; University of Alabama, University.
Arizona: University of Arizona, Tucson.
Arkansas: University of Arkansas, Fayetteville.

California: California State College at Los Angeles; California State Polytechnic College, Pomona; College of San Mateo, San Mateo; Foothill College, Los Altos Hills; Golden Gate College, San Francisco; San Jose State College; University of California, Berkeley.

Colorado: University of Denver.
District of Columbia: Howard University, Washington; The American University, Washington.

Florida: Florida A & M University, Tallahassee; Florida State University, Tallahassee; Florida Technological University, Orlando; Manatee Junior College, Bradenton; Miami Dade Junior College, South Campus, Miami; Pensacola Junior College; University of Florida, Gainesville; University of Miami, Coral Gables; University of South Florida, Tampa; University of West Florida, Pensacola.

Georgia: Berry College, Mt. Berry; Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta.

Idaho: University of Idaho, Moscow.
Illinois: Bradley University, Peoria; Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago; Northwestern University, Technological Institute, Evanston; Southern Illinois University, Carbondale; University of Illinois, Urbana.

Indiana: Indiana Institute of Technology, Fort Wayne; Indiana State University, Terre Haute; Purdue University, Lafayette; Tri-State College, Angola; University of Evansville.

Iowa: Iowa State University, Ames.
Kansas: Friends University, Wichita; Kansas State University, Manhattan.

Kentucky: University of Louisville; Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green.

Louisiana: Louisiana Polytechnic Institute Ruston; Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge.

Massachusetts: Cambridge School, Boston; Northeastern University, Boston.

Michigan: Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant; Delta College, University Center; Detroit Institute of Technology, Detroit; Ferris State College, Big Rapids; General Motors Institute, Flint; Kalamazoo College,

S4396

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 23, 1968

Kalamazoo; University of Detroit; University of Michigan, Dearborn; Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo.

Minnesota: Concordia College, Moorhead; University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Mississippi: Mississippi State University, State College.

Missouri: Rockhurst College, Kansas City; University of Missouri, Columbia; University of Missouri at Rolla; W. & W. Technical Institute, Neosho.

New Jersey: Bloomfield College, Bloomfield; Rutgers University, New Brunswick.

New Mexico: New Mexico Institute of Mining & Technology, Socorro; New Mexico State University, University Park.

New York: Adelphi University, Garden City; Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson; Borough of Manhattan Community College, New York City; Broome Technical Community College, Binghamton; City College of the City University of New York, N.Y.C.; College of Insurance, New York City; Cornell University, Ithaca; Elmira College, Elmira; Keuka College, Keuka Park; Mohawk Valley Community College, Utica; New York Institute of Technology, Old Westbury; Pratt Institute, Brooklyn; Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy; Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester; Voorhes Technical Institute, New York City.

Ohio: Antioch College, Yellow Springs; The Cleveland State University, Cleveland (formerly Fenn College); Kent State University, Kent; Ohio College of Applied Science, Cincinnati; Sinclair Community College, Dayton; University of Akron; University of Cincinnati; Wilberforce University, Wilberforce; Wilmington College, Wilmington.

Pennsylvania: Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia; St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia; Temple University Technical Institute, Philadelphia; The Pennsylvania State University, University Park.

Rhode Island: Roger Williams Junior College, Providence.

Tennessee: Tennessee A and I State University, Nashville; Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville; University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Texas: Lamar State College of Technology, Beaumont; Southern Methodist University, Dallas; Texas A & M University, College Station; University of Houston, Houston; University of St. Thomas, Houston; University of Texas at Arlington; University of Texas, Austin.

Vermont: Bennington College, Bennington; Goddard College, Plainfield.

Virginia: Hampton Institute, Hampton; Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg.

Washington: Washington State University, Pullman.

West Virginia: Alderson-Broaddus College, Phillippi.

Wisconsin: Beloit College, Beloit; Marquette University, Milwaukee; Milwaukee School of Engineering, Milwaukee; Stout State University, Menomonie; University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee; Wisconsin State University-Platteville, Platteville.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 698, THE INTERGOVERNMENT COOPERATION ACT

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Committee on Government Operations, will hold hearings on S. 698, the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act, beginning on May 9 and 10, and continuing on May 14, 15, and 16. Subsequent hearings will be announced at a later date.

S. 698 embodies, with some modifications, the provisions of S. 561, which was

passed by the Senate in August of 1965, and of S. 1681, which was passed by the Senate in July of 1966, together with some new provisions.

It is the purpose of S. 698 to achieve a more complete cooperation and coordination among the levels of Government in order to improve the operation of our Federal system in an increasingly complex society. The bill is based on investigations made by the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations over the last 5 years, on the studies and recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and on many suggestions offered by witnesses in hearings held on S. 561, S. 1681 and other legislation.

This legislation would, among other things, improve the administration of grants-in-aids to the States, provide for periodic congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid, make provision for reimbursable technical services by Federal agencies to States and local governments, provide for coordinated intergovernmental policy and administration of Federal assistance for urban development, provide for the acquisition, use and disposition of land within urban areas by Federal agencies in conformity with local government programs, and establish a uniform relocation assistance policy for persons and businesses displaced by Federal or federally assisted programs. These provisions have been the subject of earlier hearings held in connection with S. 561 and S. 1681.

New provisions of S. 698 would provide a method for the consolidation of Federal grant-in-aid programs and would establish a uniform land acquisition policy for Federal programs and federally assisted programs.

The hearings on May 9 and 10 will be in room 3302, New Senate Office Building, beginning at 10 a.m. The time and place of subsequent hearings will be announced later.

Any Senator or other person wishing to testify should notify the subcommittee, room 357, Old Senate Office Building, extension 4718, in order that he might be scheduled as a witness.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF EDWARD WEINBERG, OF MARYLAND, TO BE SOLICITOR, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, the President has nominated Edward Weinberg, of Maryland, as Solicitor for the Department of the Interior. Hearings will be held on April 25 at 2:30 p.m. in room 3110, New Senate Office Building. Those desiring to be heard will please notify the clerk of the committee.

CONFERENCE ENDORSES INTERNATIONAL HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND LABOR BILL, S. 1779; HEARINGS ANNOUNCED FOR THURSDAY AND FRIDAY APRIL 25 AND 26

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Third Inter-American Conference of the Partners of the Alliance was held in Lima, Peru, from Sunday, March 31, until Thursday, April 4, 1968. The conference

was attended by 298 participants from 17 Latin American countries and 34 States of the United States.

There were four committees which issued reports at the conference, one of these being the Committee on Education. I was pleased to learn that this committee passed only two resolutions, one of which was a resolution of support for my bill S. 1779, to establish an International Health, Education, and Labor Foundation designed to strengthen and maintain free and independent societies.

This is indeed a matter of significant timing since hearings on this important bill will be held this Thursday and Friday, April 25 and 26, at 10 a.m. in room 4230 of the New Senate Office Building.

To illustrate the importance of this measure I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution adopted at the Conference in Lima, Peru, and a copy of my bill, S. 1779, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS

Senate Bill No. 1779 has been discussed and evaluated by the United States delegates who are members of the Committee on Education of the Third Inter-American Conference of the Partners of the Alliance for Progress. Committed as all of our partners are to the strengthening of inter-American understanding, we applaud and support the effort of Senator YARBOROUGH and his Senate colleagues in seeking the establishment of an International Health, Education and Labor Foundation designed to increase the bonds of friendship among the peoples of the world and to strengthen their capacities to develop and maintain free and independent societies. We, therefore, recommend that the United States delegates members of this Committee, acquaint themselves with the bill and support the objectives and the goals which the sponsors of Bill 1779 are endeavoring to secure in the Congress of USA.

ARTHUR WARNER,
Chairman.
EDUARDO KING CARR,
Cochairman.

S. 1779

A bill to establish an international health, education and labor program to provide open support for private, nongovernmental activities in the fields of health, education, and labor, and other welfare fields

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

ESTABLISHMENT OF FOUNDATION

SECTION 1. (a) There is hereby established as an independent agency of the Government an International Health, Education, and Labor Foundation (hereinafter referred to as the "Foundation").

(b) The Foundation shall be composed of a Director and an International Health, Education, and Labor Council (hereinafter referred to as the "Council").

(c) The purposes of the Foundation shall be establish and conduct an international health, education, and labor program under which the Foundation shall provide open support for private, nongovernmental activities in the fields of health, education, and labor, and other welfare fields, designed—

(1) to promote a better knowledge of the United States among the peoples of the world;

(2) to increase friendship and understanding among the peoples of the world; and

(3) to strengthen the capacity of the

April 23, 1968

S 4397

other peoples of the world to develop and maintain free, independent societies in their own nations.

DIRECTOR OF FOUNDATION

SEC. 2. (a) The Foundation shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The person nominated for appointment as the Director shall be a distinguished citizen who has demonstrated exceptional qualities and abilities necessary to enable him to successfully perform the functions of the office of the Director.

(b) The Director shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level II of the Executive Schedule under section 5311 of title 5, United States Code, and shall serve for a term of five years.

(c) The Director, with the advice of the Council, shall exercise all of the authority granted to the Foundation by this Act and shall serve as chief executive officer of the Foundation.

COUNCIL

SEC. 3. (a) The Council shall consist of eleven members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The persons nominated for appointment as members of the Council (1) shall be eminent in the fields of education, student activities, youth activities, labor, health, scientific research or other fields pertinent to the functions of the Foundation; (2) shall be selected solely on the basis of established records of distinguished service; and (3) shall not be officers or employees of the Government of the United States. The President is requested, in the making of nominations of persons for appointment as members, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nomination which may be submitted to him by leading private associations, institutions, and organizations concerned with private activities in the fields of health, education, and labor, and other welfare fields related to the purposes set forth in the first section of this Act.

(b) The term of office of each member of the Council shall be six years, except that (1) the terms of the members first appointed shall expire, as designated by the President, three at the end of two years, four at the end of four years, and four at the end of six years after the date of enactment of this Act; and (2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy shall serve for the remainder of the term for which his predecessor was appointed. No member shall be eligible for reappointment during the two-year period following the expiration of his term.

(c) The members of the Council shall receive compensation at the rate of \$100 for each day engaged in the business of the Foundation and shall be allowed travel expenses as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) The President shall call the first meeting of the Council and designate an Acting Chairman. The Board shall, from time to time thereafter, select one of its members to serve as Chairman of the Council.

(e) The Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman, but not less than once every six months. Six members of the Council shall constitute a quorum.

(f) The Council (1) shall advise the Director with respect to policies, programs, and procedures for carrying out his functions, and (2) shall review applications for financial support submitted pursuant to section 4 and make recommendations thereon to the Director. The Director shall not approve or disapprove any such application until he has received the recommendation of the Council thereon, unless the Council fails to make a recommendation on such application within a reasonable time.

(g) The Council shall, on or before the 31st day of January, of each year, submit an annual report to the President and the Con-

gress summarizing the activities of the Council during the preceding calendar year and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate. The contents of each report so submitted shall promptly be made available to the public.

GRANTS IN SUPPORT OF PRIVATE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 4. (a) To effectuate the purposes of this Act, the Director is authorized, subject to section 3(f), to make grants to private, nonprofit agencies, associations, and organizations organized in the United States, to public or private nonprofit educational institutions located in the United States, and to individuals or groups of individuals who are citizens of the United States not employed by the Government of the United States, a State or political subdivision of a State, or the District of Columbia, for the purpose of enabling them to assist, provide, or participate in international activities, conferences, meetings, and seminars in the fields of health, education, and labor, and other welfare fields related to the purposes set forth in the first section of this Act. No portion of any funds granted under this section shall be paid by the Director, or by any recipient of a grant under this section, to support any intelligence-gathering activity on behalf of the United States or to support any activity carried on by any officer or employee of the United States.

(b) Each grant shall be made by the Director under this section only upon application therefor in such form and containing such information as may be required by the Director and only on condition that the recipient of such grant will conduct openly all activities supported by such grant and make such reports as the Director may require solely to determine that the funds so granted are applied to the purpose for which application is made.

(c) The Director shall develop procedures and rules with respect to the approval or disapproval of applications for grants under this section which will provide, insofar as practicable, an equitable distribution of grants among the various applicants for such grants and types of activities to be supported by such grants, but which will assure that grants will be made to those qualified recipients most capable of achieving a successful or significant contribution favorably related to the purposes set forth in the first section of this Act. In making grants under this section, the Director shall not impose any requirements therefor or conditions thereon which impair the freedom of thought and expression of any recipients or other beneficiaries such grants.

(d) The Director may (1) pay grants in such installments as he may deem appropriate and (2) provide for such adjustment of payments under this section as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, total withholding of payments.

PUBLIC REPORTS BY DIRECTOR

SEC. 5. The Director shall, on or before the 31st day of January of each year, submit an annual report to the President and the Congress setting forth a summary of his activities under this Act during the preceding calendar year. Such report shall include a list of the grants made by the Director during the preceding calendar year; a statement of the use to which each recipient applied any grant received during the preceding calendar year; and any recommendations which the Director may deem appropriate. The contents of each report so submitted shall promptly be made available to the public.

GENERAL AUTHORITY

SEC. 6. The Director shall have authority, within the limits of funds available under section 9, to—

(1) prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary governing the manner of the operations of the Foundation, and its organizations and personnel;

(2) appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to enable the Foundation to carry out its functions under this Act, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service and the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates: except that the salary of any person so employed shall not exceed the maximum salary established by the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code;

(3) obtain the services of experts and consultants from private life, as may be required by the Director or the Council, in accordance with the provisions of section 3109 of title 5, United States Code;

(4) accept and utilize on behalf of the Foundation the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel from private life and reimburse them for travel expenses, including per diem, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code;

(5) receive money and other property donated, bequeathed, or devised, by private, nongovernmental sources, without condition or restriction other than that it be used for any of the purposes of the Foundation; and to use, sell, or otherwise dispose of such property in carrying out the purposes of this Act; and

(6) make other expenditures necessary to carry into effect the purposes of this Act.

PROHIBITION AGAINST REQUIRING INTELLIGENCE GATHERING

SEC. 7. No department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall request or require any recipient or any other beneficiary of any grant made under this Act to obtain, furnish, or report, or cause to be obtained, furnished, or reported, any information relating, directly or indirectly, to any activity supported by such grant, except as is (1) provided by section 4(b) of this Act or (2) authorized under law in the case of any information directly relating to the violation of any criminal law of the United States by such recipient or beneficiary.

INDEPENDENCE FROM EXECUTIVE CONTROL

SEC. 8. (a) Determinations made by the Director and the Council in the discharge of their functions under this Act shall not be subject to review or control by the President or by any other department, agency, officer, or employee of the Government.

(b) The provisions of subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code (relating to administrative procedure), and of chapter 7 of such title (relating to judicial review), shall not apply with respect to the exercise by the Director or the Council of their functions under this Act.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, except that the aggregate of such sums appropriated prior to June 30, 1972, shall not exceed \$100 million. Sums appropriated under this section shall remain available until expended.

THE REAL OBJECTION TO HOLDING PRELIMINARY TALKS IN CAMBODIA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there has been considerable critical comment over the refusal of President Johnson to agree to the proposal of North Vietnam that preliminary talks be held at Phnom Penh, Cambodia. Hanoi has claimed that this refusal indicates bad faith on the part of the President when he stated several weeks ago that the United States

S 4398

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 23, 1968

would go anywhere at any time to engage in talks.

State Department spokesmen have stated that the reason for rejection of Cambodia is that we do not have diplomatic relations with its Government. But what has not been stated is the real reason, and the failure of the administration to state it publicly is another example of the credibility gap—the failure to give the American people the facts in pursuance of their right to know.

The real reason came to light yesterday.

In an April 22 Washington Post column, entitled "New Cambodian Route Aids Expansion of VC Forces," the knowledgeable columnist Joseph Alsop points out that thousands of tons of war materiel have been landed at Cambodian ports by freighters, then carried forward over the Cambodian roads and rivers, "not, apparently, without the help of purchased persons in the Cambodian Defense Ministry—for army trucks are known to have been used. Thus they are moved to the Vietnamese border and along the border roads North Vietnamese have secretly built."

Mr. Alsop points out that these supplies are then transported from the Cambodian border by sampan convoys over the river and canal system—especially in the III and IV Corps Areas of South Vietnam.

He concludes his article by saying:

The existence of this new system has been known in Washington for many months. Nothing has been said about it. And the puzzle is why the American Government is perfectly content to observe the old rules, while always permitting the enemy to fight the war by quite a different, exceedingly novel set of rules.

It is high time, Mr. President, for the administration to not only let the American people know the facts about Cambodia, but to take appropriate action to protect our fighting men and those of our allies from this source of war materiel. It would, of course, be unthinkable to hold talks in any country which is being used by North Vietnam to supply its forces in South Vietnam. And it is unthinkable that, as Mr. Alsop points out, nothing has been said about the situation by those in control of our Federal Government. The people want to know "Why not?"

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Alsop's article be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 22, 1968]
NEW CAMBODIAN ROUTE AIDS EXPANSION OF VC FORCES

(By Joseph Alsop)

CANTHO, SOUTH VIETNAM.—In this largest city of the Vietnamese Delta, headquarters of all IV Corps, there are many things worthy of note. There is the successfully aggressive energy of the new ARVN corps commander, Gen. Nguyen Duc Thanh, to begin with.

There are the vast smokes still billowing up from one of the greatest VC secret base areas, the huge impenetrable Umin Forest. The first fire was set by fishermen enraged by the VC and, at the moment, our aircraft cannot go in to encourage the flames with napalm, because the secondary explosions

are too numerous and violent to permit low-level bombing runs.

Again, there is the fact that village people long under VC control have held angry demonstrations and have even attacked VC cadre, because their sons and sampans were "borrowed" from them for the Tet offensive, and have not been returned for the grimmest possible reason. This has even happened in the Camau Peninsula, in several districts that have been under Communist control for a quarter of a century.

On the other side of the balance sheet, there is the ominous fact that the VC are now substantially expanding their armed forces in the Delta, for example, by increasing their main force and provincial battalions from 24 to 33 in both categories. In a large measure, this is being accomplished by short-range measures of a risky character—press-ganging the youth, raising taxes harshly, and so on and on. But the Delta is one remaining manpower pool in South Vietnam and the VC are doing their best to exploit the pool's resources to the utmost.

That fact hooks on, quite directly, to the second fact that stands out like a sore thumb on the minus side of the Delta balance sheet. Briefly, the Delta's remaining manpower has not been exploited to the utmost by the VC since the great "victory" drafts of 1965, because there were two important limiting factors.

The least important was the VC desire not to alienate too many of the people in this region really beyond Hanoi's easy reach. The decisive factor was, quite simply, the larger forces in the Delta could not be supplied and maintained by the lines of communication that were still in use until less than a year ago.

All that is changed now, however. In IV Corps, in III Corps and in at least half of II Corps, all needed military supplies now originate in Cambodia; and in III and II Corps, Cambodia also provides most of the food for the bigger enemy units.

There is, in fact, a brand new supply system that began to operate less than a year ago, toward the beginning of the Delta's last high-water season. A defector from high up in the supply apparatus has explained exactly how it works.

Weapons, ammunition and the like are now landed at Cambodian ports by freighters carrying very big shipments. They are then carried forward over the Cambodian road and river not, apparently, without the help of purchased persons in the Cambodian Defense Ministry—for army trucks are known to have been used. Thus they are moved to the Vietnamese border and along the border roads the North Vietnamese have secretly built.

For the delta, the supplies off-loaded at the border are then transported forward to points of use in night-moving sampan convoys, over the river and canal system that covers this whole area.

The defector above-mentioned stated that in the last high-water season there had been two big sampan convoys per month throughout the whole season, delivering above 10,000 tons of supplies to the VC in the Delta alone.

In III Corps, supplies move into the so-called parrot's beak, where the Cambodian border thrusts inward toward Saigon; and thence they again move forward by sampan over the river system. In this Corps area, too, lateral roads newly built by the North Vietnamese troops into the border's jungles, are also used for supply movements by bicycle and even by truck.

The new Cambodian system is known to have provided over 30,000 tons of supplies for the enemy in III Corps, plus an unknown but large total for the enemy in II Corps in the last year. This, of course, solves a major puzzle.

The puzzle was to know how the old lines of communication could carry the load of the

big North Vietnamese reinforcement flow, plus the huge additional supply load required by the new, much heavier, much more advanced weaponry the enemy has now introduced.

The answer to the puzzle is the new Cambodian supply system.

That does not answer another puzzle, however. The existence of this new system has been known in Washington for many months. Nothing has been said about it. And the puzzle is why the American Government is perfectly content to observe the old rules, while always permitting the enemy to fight the war by quite a different, exceedingly novel set of rules.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 20 minutes in the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

OIL IMPORT PROGRAM NEEDS RE-EXAMINATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have the unpleasant duty to bring to the attention of the Senate once again the startling inequities that continue to plague the oil import program.

The program must be changed to fulfill its announced goals. A halting start has been made in the form of proposed changes in the oil import regulations, but more needs to be done now. The oil import quota program has been in existence for almost 10 years without ever really having its underlying rationale scrutinized.

Secretary Udall, the day before I made my last speech on the program, announced that he would hold public departmental hearings in order to re-evaluate the program. I had hoped that, perhaps, something would come out of these hearings in which the Secretary had announced he would take a personal part. After all, no one, to my knowledge, has ever questioned the Secretary's personal integrity or his ability to correct defects in his Department once he took a personal interest in a problem.

However, at his press conference on Wednesday, April 17, 1968, Secretary Udall announced that he would not hold these badly needed hearings because he saw "no necessity" for them. I find that statement incomprehensible.

I have come across many irregularities and irrationalities in the program that must be corrected. I am no oil or petrochemical expert, but by just applying a little commonsense, I can see the program is not meeting its stated goals, is forcing the American consumer to pay higher prices, is creating an artificial economic situation, and is injuring our balance of payments posture.

Let me reiterate for a moment some of the defects in the program which I have already brought to Secretary's Udall's attention.

A few weeks ago the Secretary increased the oil import allocation for petrochemical producers by 12,000 barrels a day and Standard Oil of Indiana received 7,213 of the total for an energy